



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/659,997	09/11/2003	Carl E. Linton	CVAC-001/00US 313579-2010	8998
58249	7590	07/06/2011	EXAMINER	
COOLEY LLP ATTN: Patent Group Suite 1100 777 - 6th Street, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001			FLETCHER, JERRY-DARYL	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3715	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/06/2011	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/659,997	Applicant(s) LINTON, CARL E.	
	Examiner JERRY-DARYL FLETCHER	Art Unit 3715	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2011.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>04/07/2011</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a **FINAL OFFICE ACTION** in response to communications received on 04/07/2011. Claims 1-20, 22-25 and 27-39 have been amended, claims 21 and 26 have remained as previously presented, and claims 40-45 have been newly added. Claims 1-45 are currently pending in the application and are addressed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA" as evidenced by "Introducing the CVAC Process", Item #5 of IDS filed 12/10/2003; Applicant's Remarks, 03/03/2008; Reid, W., "Device Enhances Performances for Local Athletes," Item #2 of IDS filed 04/08/2006; "Introducing CVAC", Item #4 of IDS filed 12/10/2003) in view of Shusterman (US 2003/0205230).

Re Claim 1: The AAPA discloses a pressure vessel capable of being opened to receive a user and closed to create a hermetic seal ("Introducing the CVAC Process: What is CVAC", Item #5 of IDS filed 12/10/2003), the pressure vessel comprising an on-board interface capable of enabling a user to control one or more functions of the pressure vessel unit, a pressure transducer capable of monitoring air pressure inside the pressure vessel, a blower capable of removing air from the pressure vessel, and a

proportioning valve capable of controlling the amount of air allowed to enter into the pressure vessel (Applicant's Remarks, 03/03/2008, Page 12).

Note that while the references do not specifically include the term "hermetic seal," it is inherent of a pressure vessel that controls pressure to include a hermetic seal; without a hermetic seal, air pressure cannot be controlled.

However, the AAPA does not specifically disclose a user sensor capable of measuring one or more parameters of a user's body condition.

Shusterman teaches a pressure controlled chamber wherein user sensors electrically connected to a control panel, and are capable of measuring one or more parameters of a user's body condition are used (par. 0076) and further wherein the sensors are used to change a predetermined program (par. 0078).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a user sensor capable of measuring one or more parameters of a user's body condition, thereby allowing a control system to modify the pressure in the chamber based on the user's varying physiological conditions.

Re claim 41: The limitations of providing payment on the on-board interface or kiosk have been discussed below with regard to claim 24.

Re claim 42: AAPA further discloses that the on-board interface was disposed inside of the pressure vessel (*pressure vessel included a mouse allowing the user to stop the pressure vessel unit*) (Applicant's Remarks, 03/03/2008, Page 12).

4. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's Admitted Prior Art and Shusterman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Butler (US Patent Application Publication 2004/0261796).

Re Claim 6: The AAPA and Shusterman do not specifically disclose an external controller placed in electrical communication with the system to initiate a session.

Butler discloses electronic controls and external controller placed in electrical communication with the system to initiate sessions (Fig. 7; Paragraphs 114-122).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include an external controller placed in electrical communication with the system to initiate sessions, thereby providing an operator control of the system.

Re Claim 7-9: The AAPA does not specifically disclose the user sensor placed in electrical communication with the external controller, the external controller being capable of monitoring readings from the user sensor to determine whether a measured parameter of a user's body condition is at a level sufficient enough to warrant a selection or modification of a predetermined program regulating cyclic variations in altitude conditioning.

Shusterman discloses the user sensor placed in electrical communication with the external controller for selection and modification of programs based on measured parameters (par. 0078).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have the user sensor placed in electrical communication with the external controller, the external controller being capable of monitoring readings from the user sensor to determine whether a measured parameter of a user's body condition is at a level sufficient enough to warrant a modification of a predetermined program regulating cyclic variations in altitude conditioning, thereby providing conditioning that takes into account user safety and desired goals.

5. Claims 10, 15-39 and 43-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA and Shusterman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Butler and Cook (US Patent No: 5,727,950).

Re Claims 10, 21-23, 25: Note that claims 10, 21-23, 25 include the pressure vessel of claim 1, and additionally a kiosk controller and a master controller (claim 10) that are separately located (claim 21) and wherein the master controller is capable of storing information entered in the kiosk controller or onboard interface (claim 22) and further wherein the master controller makes information available to multiple kiosk controllers (claim 23), and downloading data from the kiosk controller to the master controller, wherein the data relates to the user and was previously entered and stored on the kiosk controller (claim 25).

Butler discloses that the chamber is computer controlled (Paragraphs 115).

Cook discloses that it is known in the art of computing to use a distributed computing system with local and remote information storage, wherein information stored

at a remote server is accessible to a plurality of computing devices, and further teaches the downloading an aggregation of material onto a centralized repository (col. 4, ll. 34-45; col. 17, ll. 16-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a kiosk controller and a master controller comprising first and second software programs, and information processing systems for executing the programs, such that the controllers are able to control the pressure vessel system with a series of programs adaptive to various situations and parameters. By supplementing the modified invention with the distributed computing environment, as taught by Cook, it would have enabled the invention to benefit from lesser redundancy in entering information, and greater security of remote data, and represents a combination of known elements to yield a predictable result.

Re Claims 15-20: Note that claims 15-20, dependent on claim 10, include limitations also found in claims 6-9, dependent on claim 1, except that claims 15-20 relate to the kiosk controller (instead of an "external controller"). Also with regard to claims 19 and 20, it is claimed that the information processing system, instead of the external controller, is capable of performing the tasks as described in claims 7-9. It is claimed in claim 10 that the information processing system is included in the kiosk controller. Claims 6-9 have each been discussed above. It has been discussed in regard to claim 10 that the kiosk controller is coupled to the sensors and measurement devices and controls the operation of the pressure vessel.

Re Claim 24: Note that claim 24 includes limitations of making available to a user the system of claim 10, and allowing the user to pay for a session in the system via an entry of payment information relating to the user into the kiosk controller.

The AAPA inherently discloses making a system for cyclic variations in altitude conditioning available to a user.

However, it is not specifically disclosed how the user of the system pays for services.

Applicant agrees that it is well known in the art to provide payment methods to a system through a controlling kiosk or on the system through bill receptors, change receptors, magnetic strips, smart cards, radio frequency, keypad entry of identification, keypad entry of credit information, etc.

Re Claim 26: The limitations of claim 26 have been discussed with regard to claim 21.

Re Claims 27-28: The limitations of claims 27-28 have been discussed with regard to claim 23 above.

Re Claim 29: The AAPA discloses requiring a user to successfully complete a set up program in order to ensure that the user is capable of safely completing a regular session of cyclic variations in altitude conditioning ("Introducing the CVAC Process:

How to Get Started”, Item #5 of IDS filed 12/10/2003) but fails to specifically disclose that the requirement is verified. **OFFICIAL NOTICE** is taken that it is old and well known to require verification of training prior to allowing a user to operate a machine, such as is the case with the verification of passing a driver's test prior to issuing a driver's license to operate a vehicle.

It would have been obvious to one possessing ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have required verification of the user's successful completion of the set-up program in order to ensure that the user was capable of operating the system.

Re Claim 30: The AAPA does not specifically disclose accessing data related to a user from the kiosk controller or master controller in order to determine a suitable program for the user based upon the user's history of use.

Cook discloses accessing data related to a user to determine a suitable program for the user based on the user's history of use (col. 17, ll. 40-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to access data related to a user's history to determine a suitable program for the user, thereby determining and providing the most effective program adapted specifically for the user.

Re Claims 31-33: The limitations of claims 31-33 have been discussed above with regard to claims 3-5.

Re Claims 34-35: The limitation of enabling the user to successfully complete a set-up session in a pressure vessel has been discussed with regard to claim 29. The limitation of enabling the user to undergo rapid transitions between simulated altitude in the pressure vessel according to cycles determined by a program are disclosed by the AAPA (CVAC). The limitation of using a user sensor to measure a parameter of the user's body condition and selecting or altering the program based on the measured parameter has been discussed with regard to at least claims 7-9.

The AAPA additionally discloses that the cyclic variation in altitude conditioning program is tailored to an individual's body type ("Introducing CVAC: What is CVAC", Item #4 of IDS filed 12/10/2003).

However, the AAPA does not specifically disclose body type categories and selecting a program based on the category.

Cook discloses that programs are designed based on the user's data (col. 17, ll. 40-48).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to have supplemented the invention by using user data (profiles) to create specific treatments based on the user's data in order to yield the predictable result of ensuring that the treatments were commensurate with the individual users.

Re Claims 36-39: The limitations of providing payment on the on-board interface or kiosk have been discussed above with regard to claim 24.

Re Claim 43: The limitation of providing the on-board interface inside the pressure vessel has been discussed above with regard to claim 43.

Re Claims 44-45: Cook discloses receiving data entered by a user prior to classifying (*the design of a program based on user inputted data*) (col. 5, ll. 31-45), and the limitation of executing a set-up session prior to the executing of a session has been discussed above with regard to claim 29.

6. Claims 2-5 and 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the AAPA in view of, Shusterman, Butler and Cook, as applied to claims 1 and 6-10 above, and further in view of Galerne (US Patent No. 4,227,524).

Re Claims 2-5: Claims 2-5 include an on-board interface and user sensor performing the limitations of claims 6-9, already discussed above; wherein the on-board interface of claims 2-5 essentially replace the external controller of claims 6-9.

The AAPA discloses an on-board interface (Applicant's Remarks, 03/03/2008, Page 12).

However, the AAPA does not specifically disclose the on-board interface selecting and altering the cyclic variations in altitude conditioning program.

Galerne discloses a pressure chamber system wherein controls for regulating the system may be placed inside and outside the vessel (Col. 16, Lines 36-42).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the on-board interface be capable of monitoring readings

Art Unit: 3715

from the user sensor to determine whether a measured parameter of a user's body condition is at a level sufficient enough to warrant a modification of a predetermined program regulating cyclic variations in altitude conditioning, thereby achieving the predictable result of providing a user of the system control of the system while using the system.

Re Claims 11-14: Note that claims 11-14, dependent on claim 10, include limitations found in claims 2-5, dependent on claim 1, each of which have been discussed above.

7. Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over AAPA in view of Shusterman as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Swift (US Patent No. 4,777,974).

Re claim 40: AAPA and Shusterman disclose the limitations of claim 1 but fail to specifically disclose that the wall includes a burst panel.

Swift discloses that it is known to utilize burst panels to relieve fluid pressure in structures when the fluid pressure in the structures exceed predetermined thresholds (col. 1, ll. 25-48).

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-45 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically, newly applied prior art

references of Shusterman and Swift, when combined with the other prior art references, teach the claimed invention (See rejections above).

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JERRY-DARYL FLETCHER whose telephone number is (571)270-5054. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday 9:00 a.m. to 5:30 p.m..

Art Unit: 3715

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Xuan M. Thai can be reached on (571) 272-7147. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J.D.F./
Examiner, Art Unit 3715

/XUAN M. THAI/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3715